arXiv:math/0503723v4 [math.FA] 27 Dec 2005

The Essential Norm of Composition Operator between Generalized Bloch Spaces in Polydiscs and its Applications

Zehua Zhou and Yan Liu
Department of Mathematics, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China
E-mail: zehuazhou2003@yahoo.com.cn and zhzhou@tju.edu.cn

[1]

Abstract

Let U^n be the unit polydisc of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\phi = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n)$ a holomorphic self-map of U^n. By $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$, $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ and $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$ denote the p-Bloch space, Little p-Bloch space and Little star p-Bloch space in the unit polydisc U^n respectively, where $p, q > 0$. This paper gives the estimates of the essential norms of bounded composition operators C_ϕ induced by ϕ between $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$) and $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$). As their applications, some necessary and sufficient conditions for the bounded composition operators C_ϕ to be compact from $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$) into $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$) are obtained.

Keywords Bloch space; Polydisc; Composition operator; Essential norm
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification 47B38, 32A37, 47B33, 32A30

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded homogeneous domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The class of all holomorphic functions with domain Ω will be denoted by $H(\Omega)$. Let ϕ be a holomorphic self-map of Ω, the composition operator C_ϕ induced by ϕ is defined by

$$(C_\phi f)(z) = f(\phi(z)),$$

for z in Ω and $f \in H(\Omega)$.

Let $K(z,z)$ be the Bergman kernel function of Ω, the Bergman metric $H_z(u,u)$ in Ω is defined by

$$H_z(u,u) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 \log K(z,z)}{\partial z_j \partial \overline{z}_k} u_j \overline{u}_k,$$

where $z \in \Omega$ and $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

Following Timoney [1], we say that $f \in H(\Omega)$ is in the Bloch space $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$, if

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}(\Omega)} = \sup_{z\in\Omega} Q_f(z) < \infty,$$

---

[1] Supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grand Nos. 10371091, 10001030), and LiuHui Center for Applied Mathematics, Nankai University & Tianjin University

where

$$Q_f(z)=\sup\left\{\frac{|\bigtriangledown f(z)u|}{H_z^{\frac{1}{2}}(u,u)}:u\in\mathbb{C}^n-\{0\}\right\},\tag{1}$$

and $\bigtriangledown f(z)=\left(\frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_1},\ldots,\frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_n}\right),\bigtriangledown f(z)u=\sum\limits_{l=1}^{n}\frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_l}u_l$.

The little Bloch space $\mathcal{B}_0(\Omega)$ is the closure in the Banach space $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ of the polynomial functions.

Let $\partial\Omega$ denote the boundary of Ω. Following Timoney [2], for $\Omega=B_n$ the unit ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $\mathcal{B}_0(B_n)=\{f\in\mathcal{B}(B_n):Q_f(z)\to 0,\text{as }\ z\to\partial B_n\}$; for $\Omega=\mathcal{D}$ the bounded symmetric domain other than the ball B_n, $\{f\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}):Q_f(z)\to 0,\text{as }\ z\to\partial\mathcal{D}\}$ is the set of constant functions on $\mathcal{D}$. So if $\mathcal{D}$ is a bounded symmetric domain other than the ball, we denote the $\mathcal{B}_{0*}(\mathcal{D})=\{f\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}):Q_f(z)\to 0,\text{as }\ z\to\partial^*\mathcal{D}\}$ and call it little star Bloch space, here $\partial^*\mathcal{D}$ means the distinguished boundary of $\mathcal{D}$. The unit ball is the only bounded symmetric domain $\mathcal{D}$ with the property that $\partial^*\mathcal{D}=\partial\mathcal{D}$.

Let U^n be the unit polydisc of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Timoney [1] shows that $f\in\mathcal{B}(U^n)$ if and only if

$$\|f\|_1=|f(0)|+\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)<+\infty,$$

where $f\in H(U^n)$.

This definition was the starting point for introducing the p-Bloch spaces.

Let $p>0$, a function $f\in H(U^n)$ is said to belong to the p-Bloch space $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ if

$$\|f\|_p=|f(0)|+\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\left(1-|z_k|^2\right)^p<+\infty.$$

It is easy to show that $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$.

Just like Timoney [2], if

$$\lim_{z\to\partial U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^p=0,$$

it is easy to show that f must be a constant. Indeed, for fixed $z_1\in U$, $\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(z)(1-|z_1|^2)^p$ is a holomorphic function in $z'=(z_2,\cdots,z_n)\in U^{n-1}$. If $z\to\partial U^n$, then $z'\to\partial U^{n-1}$, which implies that

$$\lim_{z'\to\partial U^{n-1}}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(z)\right|\left(1-|z_1|^2\right)^p=0.$$

Hence, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(z)\left(1-|z_1|^2\right)^p\equiv 0$ for every $z'\in\partial U^{n-1}$, and for each $z_1\in U$, and consequently $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(z)=0$ for every $z\in U^n$. Similarly, we can obtain that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(z)=0$ for every $z_j\in U^n$ and each $j\in\{2,\cdots,n\}$, therefore $f\equiv$ *const*.

So, there is no sense to introduce the corresponding little p-Bolch space in this way. We will say that the little p-Bolch space $\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ is the closure of the polynomials in the p-Bolch space. If $f\in H(U^n)$ and

$$\sup_{z\in\partial^*U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\left(1-|z_k|^2\right)^p=0,$$

we say f belongs to little star p-Bolch space $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$. Using the same methods as that of Theorem 4.14 in reference [2], we can show that $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ is a proper subspace of $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$ and $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$ is a non-separable closed subspace of $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$.

Let ϕ be a holomorphic self-map of U^n, the composition operator C_ϕ induced by ϕ is defined by $(C_\phi f)(z) = f(\phi(z))$ for z in U^n and $f \in H(U^n)$. For the unit disc $U \subset \mathbb{C}$, Madigan and Matheson [3] proved that C_ϕ is always bounded on $\mathcal{B}(U)$ and bounded on $\mathcal{B}_0(U)$ if and only if $\phi \in \mathcal{B}_0(U)$. They also gave the sufficient and necessary conditions that C_ϕ is compact on $\mathcal{B}(U)$ or $\mathcal{B}_0(U)$. More recently, [4,5,7] gave some sufficient and necessary conditions for C_ϕ to be compact on the Bloch spaces in polydisc.

We recall that the essential norm of a continuous linear operator T is the distance from T to the compact operators, that is,

$$\|T\|_e = \inf\{\|T - K\| : K \text{ is compact}\}. \tag{2}$$

Notice that $\|T\|_e = 0$ if and only if T is compact, so that estimates on $\|T\|_e$ lead to conditions for T to be compact.

In this paper, we give some estimates of the essential norms of bounded composition operators C_ϕ between $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$) and $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$). As their consequences, some necessary and sufficient conditions for the bounded composition operators C_ϕ to be compact from $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$) into $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$) are obtained.

The fundamental ideals of the proof are those used by J. H. Shpairo [8] to obtain the essential norm of a composition operator on Hilbert spaces of analytic functions (Hardy and weighted Bergman spaces) in terms of natural counting functions associated with ϕ. This paper generalizes the result on the Bloch space in [10] to the Bloch-type space in polydisk.

Throughout the remainder of this paper C will denote a positive constant, the exact value of which will vary from one appearance to the next.

Our main results are the following:

Theorem 1 *Let* $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \cdots, \phi_n)$ *be a holomorphic self-map of* U^n *and* $\|C_\phi\|_e$ *the essential norm of a bounded composition operator* $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ *(* $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ *or* $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$*)*$\rightarrow$ $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ *(* $\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ *or* $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$*) , then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{n}\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta}\sum_{k,l=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}\\ &\le \|C_\phi\|_e \le 2\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta}\sum_{k,l=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

By Theorem 1 and the fact that $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ (or $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$)$\rightarrow$ $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ (or $\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$) is compact if and only if $\|C_\phi\|_e = 0$, we obtain Theorem 2 at once.

Theorem 2 *Let* $\phi = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n)$ *be a holomorphic self-map of* U^n*. Then the bounded composition operator* $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ *(*$\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ *or* $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$*)*$\rightarrow$ $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ *(*$\mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ *or* $\mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$*) is compact if and only if for any* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists a* δ *with* $0 < \delta < 1$, *such that*

$$\sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta}\sum_{k,l=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} < \varepsilon. \tag{4}$$

When $n = 1$, on $\mathcal{B}(U)$ we obtain Theorem 2 in [3]. Since $\partial U = \partial^* U$, $\mathcal{B}_0(U) = \mathcal{B}_{0*}(U)$, we can also obtain Theorem 1 in [3].

By Theorem 2 and Lemmas 3, 4 and 5 in next part, we can get the following three Corollaries.

Corollary 1 *Let* $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ *be a holomorphic self-map of* U^n. *Then* $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ *or* $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ *is compact if and only if*

$$\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z) \right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} \le C$$

for all $z \in U^n$ *and (4) holds.*

Proof By Lemma 3 in next part, we know $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is bounded. It follows from Theorem 2 that $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is compact.

Conversely, if $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is compact, it is clear that $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is bounded, by Theorem 2, (4) holds.

Corollary 2 *Let* $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ *be a holomorphic self-map of* U^n. *Then* $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ *is compact if and only if* $\phi_l \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ *for every* $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ *and (4) holds.*

Proof Note that Lemma 4 in next part, similar to the proof of Corollary 1, the Corollary follows.

Corollary 3 *Let* $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ *be a holomorphic self-map of* U^n. *Then* $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ *is compact if and only if* $\phi_l \in \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ *for every* $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ *and (4) holds.*

Proof Note that Lemma 5 in next part, similar to the proof of Corollary 1, the Corollary follows.

2 Some Lemmas

In order to prove Theorem 1, we need some Lemmas.

Lemma 1 *Let* $f \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$, *then*

(1) If $0 \le p < 1$, *then* $\|f(z)| \le |f(0)| + \frac{n}{1-p}\|f\|_p$;

(2) If $p = 1$, *then* $|f(z)| \le \left(1 + \frac{1}{n \ln 2}\right) \left(\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} \ln \frac{2}{1-|z_k|^2}\right) \|f\|_p$.

(3) If $p > 1$, *then* $|f(z)| \le \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{2^{p-1}}{p-1}\right) \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(1-|z_k|^2)^{p-1}} \|f\|_p$.

Proof This Lemma can be proved by some integral estimates (if necessary, the proof can be omitted).

By the definition of $\|.\|_p$,

$$|f(0)| \le \|f\|_p, \quad \left|\frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_l}\right| \le \frac{\|f\|_p}{(1-|z_l|^2)^p} \quad (l \in \{1,2,\cdots,n\})$$

and

$$f(z)-f(0) = \int_0^1 \frac{df(tz)}{dt}dt = \sum_{l=1}^n \int_0^1 z_l \frac{\partial f}{\partial \zeta_l}(tz)dt,$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)| &\le |f(0)| + \sum_{l=1}^n |z_l| \int_0^1 \frac{\|f\|_p}{(1-t^2|z_l|^2)^p}dt \\ &\le \|f\|_p + \|f\|_p \sum_{l=1}^n \int_0^{|z_l|} \frac{1}{(1-t^2)^p}dt. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

If $p=1$,

$$\int_0^{|z_l|} \frac{1}{(1-t^2)^p}dt = \frac{1}{2}\ln\frac{1+|z_l|}{1-|z_l|} \le \frac{1}{2}\ln\frac{4}{1-|z_l|^2}. \tag{6}$$

It is clear that $\ln\dfrac{4}{1-|z_l|^2} > \ln 4 = 2\ln 2$, so

$$1 \le \frac{1}{2\ln 2}\ln\frac{4}{1-|z_l|^2} \le \frac{1}{2n\ln 2}\sum_{l=1}^n \ln\frac{4}{1-|z_l|^2}. \tag{7}$$

Combining (5),(6) and (7), we get

$$|f(z)| \le \left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2n\ln 2}\right)\left(\sum_{l=1}^n \ln\frac{4}{1-|z_l|^2}\right)\|f\|_p.$$

If $p \ne 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{|z_l|} \frac{1}{(1-t^2)^p}dt &= \int_0^{|z_l|} \frac{1}{(1-t)^p}\cdot\frac{1}{(1+t)^p}dt \\ &\le \int_0^{|z_l|} \frac{1}{(1-t)^p}dt = \frac{1-(1-|z_l|)^{-p+1}}{1-p}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

If $0<p<1$, (8) gives that $\int_0^{|z_l|}\dfrac{1}{(1-t^2)^p}dt \le \dfrac{1}{1-p}$, it follows from (5) that $|f(z)| \le \left(1+\dfrac{n}{1-p}\right)\|f\|_p$.

If $p>1$, (8) gives that

$$\int_0^{|z_l|} \frac{1}{(1-t^2)^p}dt \le \frac{1-(1-|z_l|^{p-1})}{(p-1)(1-|z_l|)^{p-1}} \le \frac{2^{p-1}}{(p-1)(1-|z_l^2|)^{p-1}},$$

it follows from (5) that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)| &\le \|f\|_p + \frac{2^{p-1}}{p-1}\left(\sum_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{(1-|z_l|^2)^{p-1}}\right)\|f\|_p \\ &\le \left(\frac{1}{n}+\frac{2^{p-1}}{p-1}\right)\left(\sum_{l=1}^n \frac{1}{(1-|z_l|^2)^{p-1}}\right)\|f\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Now the Lemma is proved.

Lemma 2 *Set*

$$f_w(z) = \int_0^{z_l} \frac{dt}{(1-\bar{w}t)^p},$$

where $w \in U$. *Then* $f \in \mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$.

Proof Since

$$\frac{\partial f_w}{\partial z_l} = (1-\overline{w}t)^{-p}, \quad \frac{\partial f_w}{\partial z_i} = 0, \quad (i \neq l),$$

it follows that

$$|f(0)| + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left| \frac{\partial f_w}{\partial z_k}(z) \right| (1-|z_k|^2)^p = \frac{(1-|z_l|^2)^p}{|1-\overline{w}t|^p} \leq (1+|z_l|^2)^p \leq 2^p.$$

Hence $f_w \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$.

Now we prove that $f_w \in \mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$. Using the asymptotic formula

$$(1-\bar{w}t)^{-p} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{p(p+1)\cdots(p+k-1)}{k!}(\bar{w})^k t^k,$$

we obtain

$$f_w(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{p(p+1)\cdots(p+k-1)}{k!}(\bar{w})^k \int_0^{z_l} t^k dt.$$

Denote $P_n(z) = \sum\limits_{k=0}^{n} \frac{p(p+1)\cdots(p+k-1)}{k!}(\bar{w})^k \int_0^{z_l} t^k dt$, it is easy to see that

$$f_w(z) - P_n(z) = \sum_{k=n+1}^{+\infty} \frac{p(p+1)\cdots(p+k-1)}{k!}(\bar{w})^k \int_0^{z_l} t^k dt,$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial(f_w - P_n)}{\partial z_l} \right| \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{+\infty} \frac{p(p+1)\cdots(p+k-1)}{k!}|w|^k \to 0, \text{as} \quad n \to \infty,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_w - P_n\|_p &= |f_w(0) - P_n(0)| + \sup_{z \in U^n} \left| \frac{\partial(f_w - P_n)}{\partial z_l} \right| (1-|z_l|^2)^p \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in U^n} \left| \frac{\partial(f_w - P_n)}{\partial z_l} \right| \to 0, \end{aligned}$$

it shows that $f_w \in \mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$. So $f \in \mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$.

Lemma 3 *Let* $\phi = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n)$ *be a holomorphic self-map of* U^n, $p, q > 0$. *Then* C_ϕ : $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ *or* $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ *is bounded if and only if there exists a constant* C *such that*

$$\sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \left| \frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z) \right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} \leq C, \tag{9}$$

for all $z \in U^n$.

Proof First assume that condition (9) holds. Let $f \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n))$, by Lemma 1, we know the evaluation at $\phi(0)$ is a bounded linear functional on $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$, so $|f(\phi(0))| \le C\|f\|_p$.

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial\left(C_\phi f(z)\right)}{\partial z_k}\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q = \sum_{k=1}^n \left|\sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_l}(\phi(z))\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q \\
&\le \sum_{k,l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_l}(\phi(z))\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q \\
&\le \sum_{l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_l}(\phi(z))\right|\left(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2\right)^p \sum_{k,l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} \qquad (10)\\
&\le \|f\|_p \sum_{k,l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}. \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

From (11) it follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial\left(C_\phi f(z)\right)}{\partial z_k}\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q \le C\|f\|_p.$$

So $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is bounded.

For the converse, assume that $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is bounded, with

$$\|C_\phi f\|_q \le C\|f\|_p \qquad (12)$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n))$.

For fixed $l(1 \le l \le n)$, we will make use of a family of test functions $\{f_w : w \in \mathbb{C}, |w| < 1\}$ in $\mathcal{B}(U^n)$ defined as follows: If $p > 0$, let

$$f_w(z) = \int_0^{z_l} (1-\overline{w}z_l)^{-p}\, dt.$$

It follows from Lemma 2 that

$$f_w \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^p(U^n).$$

For $z \in U^n$, it follows from (12) that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left|\sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial f_w(\phi(z))}{\partial \phi_l}\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q \le C. \qquad (13)$$

Let $w = \phi_l(z)$, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} \le C.$$

Now the proof of Lemma 3 is completed.

Lemma 4 *Let $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \cdots, \phi_n)$ be a holomorphic self-map of U^n. Then $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)) \to \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ is bounded if and only if $\phi_l \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ for every $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ and (9) holds.*

Proof If $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)) \to \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ is bounded , it is clear that, for every $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, $f_l(z) = z_l \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$, so $C_\phi f_l = \phi_l \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$. In the proof of Lemma 3, note that the test functions $f_w \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$, we know (9) holds.

In order to prove the Converse, we first prove that if $\phi_l \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ for every $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n.$, then $f \circ \phi \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ for any $f \in \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$.

Without loss of generality, we prove this result when $n = 2$.

For any sequence $\{z^j = (z^j_1, z^j_2)\} \subset U^n$ with $z^j \to \partial^* U^n$ as $j \to \infty$, then

$$|z^j_1| \to 1, |z^j_2| \to 1.$$

Since $|\phi_1(z^j)| < 1$ and $|\phi_2(z^j)| < 1$, there exists a subsequence $\{z^{j_s}\}$ in $\{z^j\}$ such that

$$|\phi_1(z^{j_s})| \to \rho_1, |\phi_2(z^{j_s})| \to \rho_2,$$

as $s \to \infty$.

It is clear that $0 \le \rho_1, \rho_2 \le 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{\partial(f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q \\
&\le \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|\left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q + \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|\left|\frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q \\
&= \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|(1-|\phi_1(z^{j_s})|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|\frac{(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z^{j_s})|^2)^p} \\
&+ \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|(1-|\phi_2(z^{j_s})|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|\frac{(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_2(z^{j_s})|^2)^p},
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

$k = 1, 2$.

Now we prove the left of (14) $\to 0$ as $s \to \infty$ according to four cases.

Case 1. If $\rho_1 < 1$ and $\rho_2 < 1$. It is clear that there exist r_1 and r_2 such that $\rho_1 < r_1 < 1$ and $\rho_2 < r_2 < 1$, so as j is large enough, $|\phi_1(z^{j_s})| \le r_1$ and $|\phi_2(z^{j_s})| \le r_2$.

By $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ and (14), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{\partial(f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q &\le \|f\|_p\frac{1}{(1-r_1^2)^p}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q \\
&\quad +\|f\|_p\frac{1}{(1-r_2^2)^p}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q \\
&\quad \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $s \to \infty$.

Case 2. If $\rho_1 = 1$ and $\rho_2 = 1$. Then $\phi(z^{j_s}) \to \partial^* U^n$, by (9) and $f \in \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$, (14) gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
&C\left|\frac{\partial(f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z^{j_s}_k|^2)^q \\
&C \le \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|(1-|\phi_1(z^{j_s})|^2)^p + \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|(1-|\phi_2(z^{j_s})|^2)^p \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $s \to \infty$.

Case 3. If $\rho_1 < 1$ and $\rho_2 = 1$. Similar to Case 1, we can prove that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|(1-|\phi_1(z^{j_s})|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|\frac{(1-|z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z^{j_s})|^2)^p}\\ &\le \|f\|_p\frac{1}{(1-r_1^2)^p}\left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|\frac{(1-|z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z^{j_s})|^2)^p}\to 0 \qquad (15)\end{aligned}$$

as $s \to \infty$.

On the other hand, for fixed s, let $w_2^{j_s} = \phi_2(z^{j_s})$, then $|w_2^{j_s}| < 1$. Denote

$$F(w_1) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(w_1, w_2^{j_s}).$$

It is clear that $F(w_1)$ is holomorphic on $|w_1| < 1$, choose $R_{j_s} \to 1$ with $r_1 \le R_{j_s} < 1$. $|\phi_1(z^{j_s})| \le r_1$, so

$$|F(\phi_1(z^{j_s}))| \le \max_{|w_1|\le r_1}|F(w_1)| \le \max_{|w_1|\le R_{j_s}}|F(w_1)| = \max_{|w_1|=R_{j_s}}|F(w_1)| = |F(w_1^{j_s})|,$$

where $|w_1^{j_s}| = R_{j_s} \to 1$. This means that $\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(\phi_1(z^{j_s}),\phi_2(z^{j_s}))\right| \le \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(w_1^{j_s}, w_2^{j_s})\right|$. Since $|w_1^{j_s}| \to 1, |w_2^{j_s}| \to \rho_2 = 1$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)$,

$$\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(w_1^{j_s}, w_2^{j_s})\right|(1-|w_2^{j_s}|^2)^p \to 0$$

as $s \to \infty$, so by (9),

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(\phi(z^{j_s}))\right|(1-|\phi_2(z^{j_s})|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial \phi_2}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|\frac{(1-|z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_2(z^{j_s})|^2)^p}\\ &\le C\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_2}(w_1^{j_s}, w_2^{j_s})\right|(1-|w_2^{j_s}|^2)^p \to 0 \qquad (16)\end{aligned}$$

as $s \to \infty$.

By (15) and (16), (14) gives

$$\left|\frac{\partial (f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q \to 0,$$

as $s \to \infty$.

Case 4. If $\rho_1 = 1$ and $\rho_2 < 1$. Similar to Case 3, we can prove

$$\left|\frac{\partial (f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q \to 0,$$

as $s \to \infty$.

Combining Case 1, Case 2, Case 3 and Case 4, we know there exists a subsequence $\{z^{j_s}\}$ in $\{z^j\}$ such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial (f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right|(1-|z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q \to 0,$$

as $s \to \infty$ for $k = 1, 2$. We claim that

$$\left|\frac{\partial (f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j})\right|(1-|z_k^{j}|^2)^q \to 0,$$

as $j \to \infty$. In fact, if it fails, then there exists a subsequence $\{z^{j_s}\}$ such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial(f \circ \phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right| (1 - |z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q \to \varepsilon > 0 \tag{17}$$

for $k = 1$ or 2. But from the above discussion, we can find a subsequence in $\{z^{j_s}\}$ we still write $\{z^{j_s}\}$ with

$$\left|\frac{\partial(f \circ \phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^{j_s})\right| (1 - |z_k^{j_s}|^2)^q \to 0,$$

it contradicts with (17).

So for any sequence $\{z^j\} \subset U^n$ with $z^j \to \partial^* U^n$ as $j \to \infty$, we have

$$\left|\frac{\partial(f \circ \phi)}{\partial z_k}(z^j)\right| (1 - |z_k^j|^2)^q \to 0$$

for $k = 1, 2$. By (9) and Lemma 3, it is clear that $f \circ \phi \in \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$, so $f \circ \phi \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$.

For any $f \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n))$. Since $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)) \subset \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n))$, then $f \circ \phi \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$.

By closed graph theorem we known that

$$C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)(\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)) \to \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$$

is bounded. This ends the proof of Lemma 4.

Remark 1 For the case $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$, the necessity is also true, but we can't guaranty that the sufficiency is true because we can't sure that $C_\phi f \in \mathcal{B}^q_{0*}(U^n)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n$.

Lemma 5 *Let $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \cdots, \phi_n)$ be a holomorphic self-map of U^n. Then*

$$C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$$

is bounded if and only if if and only if $\phi^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ for every multi-index γ, and (9) holds.

Proof Sufficiency. From (9) and by Theorem 1 we know that $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ is bounded, in particular

$$\|C_\phi f\|_q \le \|C_\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^p(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)} \|f\|_p, \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n).$$

The boundedness of $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ directly follows, if we prove $C_\phi f \in \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ whenever $f \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$. So, let $f \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$. By the definition of $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ it follows that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a polynomial p_ε such that $\|f - p_\varepsilon\|_p < \varepsilon$. Hence

$$\|C_\phi f - C_\phi p_\varepsilon\|_q \le \|C_\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^p(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)} \|f - p_\varepsilon\|_p < \varepsilon \|C_\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}^p(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)}. \tag{18}$$

Since $\phi^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ for every multi-index γ, we obtain $C_\phi p_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$. From this and (18) the result follows.

If $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n) \to \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$ is bounded, then (9) can be proved as in Lemma 3, since the test functions appearing there belong to $\mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$. Since the polynomials $z^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^p_0(U^n)$ for every multi-index γ, we get $C_\phi z^\gamma \in \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$, as desired.

Remark 2 For the case $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ $(\mathcal{B}^p_{0*}(U^n)) \to \mathcal{B}^q_0(U^n)$, similar to Remark 1, the necessity is also true, but we can't guaranty that the sufficiency is true.

Lemma 6 *If* $\{f_k\}$ *is a bounded sequence in* $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$, *then there exists a subsequence* $\{f_{k_l}\}$ *of* $\{f_k\}$ *which converges uniformly on compact subsets of* U^n *to a holomorphic function* $f \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$.

Proof Let $\{f_k\}$ be a bounded sequence in $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ with $\|f_k\|_p \le C$. By Lemma 1, $\{f_j\}$ is uniformly bounded on compact subsets of U^n and hence normal by Montel's theorem. Hence we may extract subsequence $\{f_{j_k}\}$ which converges uniformly on compact subsects of U^n to a holomorphic function f. It follows that $\dfrac{\partial f_{j_k}}{\partial z_l} \to \dfrac{\partial f}{\partial z_l}$ for each $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, so

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_l}\right| (1-|z_l|^2)^p = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial f_{j_k}}{\partial z_l}\right| (1-|z_l|^2)^p =\le \sup_k \|f_{j_k}\|_p \le C,$$

which implies $f \in \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$. The Lemma is proved.

Lemma 7 *Let* Ω *be a domain in* $\mathbb{C}^n$, $f \in H(\Omega)$. *If a compact set* K *and its neighborhood* G *satisfy* $K \subset G \subset\subset \Omega$ *and* $\rho = dist(K, \partial G) > 0$, *then*

$$\sup_{z\in K} \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(z)\right| \le \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\rho} \sup_{z\in G} |f(z)|.$$

Proof Since $\rho = dist(K, \partial G) > 0$, for any $a \in K$, the polydisc

$$P_a = \left\{(z_1, \cdots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : |z_j - a_j| < \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{n}}, j = 1, \cdots, n\right\}$$

is contained in G. By Cauchy's inequality,

$$\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(a)\right| \le \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\rho} \sup_{z\in\partial^* P_a} |f(z)| \le \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\rho} \sup_{z\in G} |f(z)|.$$

Taking the supremum for a over K gives the desired inequality.

3 The Proof of Theorem 1

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 1.

The lower estimate. It is clear that $\{m^{p-1} z_1^m\} \subset \mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}_{0*}(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}(U^n)$ for $m = 1, 2, \cdots$, and this sequence converges to zero uniformly on compact subsets of the unit polydisc U^n.

$$\|m^{p-1} z_1^m\|_p = \sup_{z\in U^n} (1-|z_1|^2)^p |m^p z_1^{m-1}|. \tag{19}$$

Let $p(x) = m^p (1-x^2)^p x^{m-1}$, then

$$p'(x) = -m^p x^{m-2} (1-x^2)^{p-1} \Big[(2p+m-1)x^2 - (m-1)\Big],$$

so $p'(x) \le 0$ for $x \in \left[\sqrt{\dfrac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}, 1\right]$, and $p'(x) \ge 0$ for $x \in \left[0, \sqrt{\dfrac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}\right]$.

That is, $p(x)$ is a decreasing function for $x \in \left[\sqrt{\dfrac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}, 1\right]$ and $p(x)$ is a increasing function for $x \in \left[0, \sqrt{\dfrac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}\right]$. Hence

$$\max_{x\in[0,1]} p(x) = p\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}\right).$$

It follows from (19) that

$$\|m^{p-1}z_1^m\|_p = p\left(\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}\right) = \left(\frac{2p}{2p+m-1}\right)^p m^p \left(\frac{m-1}{2p+m-1}\right)^{\frac{m-1}{2}} \to \left(\frac{2p}{e}\right)^p,$$

as $m \to \infty$.

Therefore, the sequence $\{m^{p-1}z_1^m\}_{m\geq 2}$ is bounded away from zero. Now we consider the normalized sequence $\{f_m = \dfrac{m^{p-1}z_1^m}{\|m^{p-1}z_1^m\|_p}\}$ which also tends to zero uniformly on compact subsets of U^n. For each $m \geq 2$, we define

$$A_m = \{z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in U^n : r_m \leq |z_1| \leq r_{m+1}\},$$

where $r_m = \sqrt{\dfrac{m-1}{2p+m-1}}$. So

$$\min_{A_m} \sum_{l=1}^n \left\{\left|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z_l}(z)\right|(1-|z_l|^2)^p\right\} = \min_{A_m}\left|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial z_1}(1-|z_1|^2)^p\right|$$
$$= \frac{(1-r_{m+1}^2)^p|m^p r_{m+1}^{m-1}|}{\|m^{p-1}z_1^m\|_p} = \left(\frac{2p+m-1}{2p+m}\right)\left(\frac{m(2p+m-1)}{(m-1)(2p+m)}\right)^{\frac{m-1}{2}} = c_m.$$

It is easy to show that c_m tends to 1 as $m \to \infty$. For the moment fix any compact operator $K : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)(\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ $(\mathcal{B}_0^q(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^q(U^n))$. The uniform convergence on compact subsets of the sequence $\{f_m\}$ to zero and the compactness of K imply that $\|Kf_m\|_q \to 0$. It is easy to show that if a bounded sequence that is contained in $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of U^n, then it also converges weakly to zero in $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$ as well as in $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$. Since $\|f_m\|_p = 1$, we have

$$\|C_\phi - K\| \geq \limsup_m \|(C_\phi - K)f_m\|_q$$
$$\geq \limsup_m (\|C_\phi f_m\|_q - \|Kf_m\|_q) = \limsup_m \|C_\phi f_m\|_q$$
$$\geq \limsup_m \sup_{z\in U^n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left\{\left|\frac{\partial(f_m\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q\right\}$$
$$= \limsup_m \sup_{z\in U^n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z))\right|\left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q$$
$$= \limsup_m \sup_{z\in U^n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p}\left|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z))\right|(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p$$

$$\geq \limsup_{m} \sup_{\phi(z)\in A_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p} \left|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z))\right| (1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p$$

$$\geq \limsup_{m} \sup_{\phi(z)\in A_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p}$$

$$\times \liminf_{m} \min_{\phi(z)\in A_m} \left|\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial w_1}(\phi(z))\right| (1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p$$

$$\geq \limsup_{m} \sup_{\phi(z)\in A_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p} \liminf_{m} c_m$$

$$\geq \limsup_{m} \sup_{\phi(z)\in A_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}\|C_\phi\|_e &= \inf\{\|C_\phi - K\| : K \text{ is compact}\}\\ &\geq \limsup_{m} \sup_{\phi(z)\in A_m} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_1}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_1(z)|^2)^p}. \qquad (20)\end{aligned}$$

For each $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$, define

$$a_l = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}. \qquad (21)$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, (21) shows that there exists a δ_0 with $0 < \delta_0 < 1$, such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} > a_l - \varepsilon, \qquad (22)$$

whenever $dist(\phi(z), \partial U^n) < \delta_0$ and $l = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Since $r_m \to 1$ as $m \to \infty$, so as m is large enough, $r_m > 1 - \delta_0$. If $\phi(z) \in A_m$, $r_m \leq |\phi_1(z)| \leq r_{m+1}$, so $1 - r_{m+1} < 1 - |\phi_1(z)| < 1 - r_m < \delta_0$, $dist(\phi_1(z), \partial U) < \delta_0$. There exists w_1 with $|w_1| = 1$ such that $dist(\phi_1(z), w_1) = dist(\phi_1(z), \partial U) < \delta_0$. Let $w = (w_1, \phi_2(z), \ldots, \phi_n(z))$, $w \in \partial U^n$, then

$$dist(\phi(z), \partial U) \leq dist(\phi(z), w) = dist(\phi_1(z), w_1) < \delta_0.$$

By (22), (20) implies that

$$\|C_\phi\|_e \geq a_1 - \varepsilon.$$

Similarly, if we choose $g_m(z) = \dfrac{m^{p-1} z_l^m}{\|m^{p-1} z_l^m\|}$, we have

$$\|C_\phi\|_e \geq a_l - \varepsilon,$$

for every $l = 2 \cdots, n$. So

$$\begin{aligned}\|C_\phi\|_e &\geq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(a_l - \varepsilon)\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(\lim_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} - \varepsilon)\\ &\geq \frac{1}{n}\lim_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta} \sum_{k,l=1}^{n} \left|\frac{\partial \phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right| \frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} - \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon \to 0$, the low estimate follows.

The upper estimate. To obtain the upper estimate we first prove the following proposition.

Proposition 1 *Let $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$ a holomorphic self-map of U^n. The operators K_m $(m \geq 2)$ as follows:*

$$K_m f(z) = f(\frac{m-1}{m} z),$$

for $f \in H(U^n)$. Then the operators K_m have the following properties:

(i) For any $f \in H(U^n)$, $K_m f \in \mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n) \subset \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$.

(ii) If $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$)$\to$ $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^q(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^q(U^n)$) is bounded, then $C_\phi K_m f \in \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^q(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^q(U^n)$) for all $f \in H(U^n)$.

(iii) For fixed m, the operator K_m is compact on $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$).

(iv) If $C_\phi : \mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$)$\to$ $\mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^q(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^q(U^n)$) is bounded, then $C_\phi K_m f \in \mathcal{B}^q(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^q(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^q(U^n)$) is compact.

(v) $\|I - K_m\| \leq 2$.

(vi) $(I - K_m)f$ converges uniformly to zero on compact subset of U^n.

Proof (i) Let $f \in H(U^n)$, $r_m = \dfrac{m-1}{m}, (0 < r_m < 1)$ and $f_m(z) = K_m f(z) = f(r_m z)$. First note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_m\|_p &= |f(0)| + \sup_{z \in U^n} \sum_{k=1}^n r_m \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(r_m z)\right| \left(1 - |z_k|^2\right)^p \\
&\leq |f(0)| + \sup_{z \in U^n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(r_m z)\right| \left(1 - |r_m z_k|^2\right)^p \leq \|f\|_p. \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $f_m \in H(\frac{1}{r_m} U^n)$. $0 < \dfrac{2}{1+r_m} < \dfrac{1}{r_m}$, $\dfrac{2}{1+r_m}\overline{U^n} \subset \dfrac{1}{r_m} U^n$. which implies that for fixed m, and $\varepsilon = \dfrac{1}{j}, j = 1, 2, \cdots$, there is a polynomial $P_m^{(j)}$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in \frac{2}{1+r_m}\overline{U^n}} |f_m(z) - P_m^{(j)}(z)| < (1 - r_m)^2 \frac{1}{j}.$$

Let $K = \overline{U^n}$, $G = \dfrac{2}{1+r_m} U^n$, $\Omega = \dfrac{1}{r_m} U^n$, then $K \subset G \subset\subset \Omega$, and $\rho = dist(K, \partial G) = \dfrac{1 - r_m}{1 + r_m} > 0$, so $\forall w \in U^n$, $k \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$, it follows from Lemma 7 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\frac{\partial (f_m - P_m^{(j)})}{\partial w_k}(w)\Big| \leq \sup_{w \in K} \Big|\frac{\partial (f_m - P_m^{(j)})}{\partial w_k}(w)\Big| \\
\leq\ & \frac{\sqrt{n}(1 + r_m)}{1 - r_m} \sup_{w \in G} |f_m(w) - P_m^{(j)}(w)| \\
\leq\ & \frac{\sqrt{n}(1 + r_m)}{1 - r_m} (1 - r_m^2) \frac{1}{j} \leq 4\sqrt{n} \frac{1}{j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial(f_m-P_m^{(j)})}{\partial w_k}(w)\Big|(1-|w_k|^p)^p \le 4n\sqrt{n}\frac{1}{j}\to 0$$

as $j\to\infty$. that is,

$$||f_m-P_m^{(j)}||_{\mathcal{B}^p}=|f_m(0)-P_m^{(j)}(0)|+\sup_{w\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial(f_m-P_m^{(j)})}{\partial w_k}(w)\Big|(1-|w_k|^p)^p\to 0.$$

$P_m^{(j)}(w)\in\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ implies that $f_m\in\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$.

(ii) By (i), as desired.

(iii) For any sequence $\{f_j\}\subset\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ ($\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$) with $\|f_j\|_p\le M$, by (i), $\{K_mf_j\}\in\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$. By Lemma 6, there is a subsequence $\{f_{j_s}\}$ of $\{f_j\}$ which converges uniformly on compact subsets of U^n to a holomorphic function $f\in\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$ and $\|f\|_p\le M$. $\left\{\dfrac{\partial f_{j_s}}{\partial z_i}\right\}$, $i=1,2,\cdots,n$, also converges uniformly on compact subsets of U^n to the holomorphic function $\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial z_i}$. So as s is large enough, for any $w\in E=\{\frac{m-1}{m}z:z\in\overline{U^n}\}\subset U^n$

$$\Big|\frac{\partial(f_{j_s}-f)}{\partial w_l}(w)\Big|<\varepsilon, \tag{24}$$

for every $l=1,2,\cdots,n$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\|K_mf_{j_s}-K_mf\|_p&=\Big\|f_{j_s}(\frac{m-1}{m}z)-f(\frac{m-1}{m}z)\Big\|_p\\
&=\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left\{\left|\frac{\partial\left[(f_{j_s}-f)(\frac{m-1}{m}z)\right]}{\partial z_k}\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^p\right\}+|f_{j_s}(0)-f(0)|\\
&\le\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\sum_{l=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial(f_{j_s}-f)}{\partial w_l}(\frac{m-1}{m}z)\Big|\frac{m-1}{m}+|f_{j_s}(0)-f(0)|\\
&\le n\sup_{w\in E_1}\frac{m-1}{m}\sum_{l=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial(f_{j_s}-f)}{\partial w_l}(w)\Big|+|f_{j_s}(0)-f(0)|\to 0,
\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

as $s\to\infty$. This shows that $\{K_mf_{j_s}\}$ converges to $g=K_mf\in\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)\subset\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)\subset\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$. So K_m is compact on $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$($\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$).

(iv) By (i) and (iii), the result is obvious.

(v) In fact, for any $f\in\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$($\mathcal{B}_0^p(U^n)$ or $\mathcal{B}_{0*}^p(U^n)$), note that $(I-K_m)f(0)=0$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(I-K_m)f\|_p&=\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial z_k}(z)\Big|(1-|z_k|^2)\\
&=n\sup_{z\in U^n}\max_{1\le k\le n}\Big|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(z)-(1-\frac{1}{m})\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}((1-\frac{1}{m})z)\Big|(1-|z_k|^2)^p\\
&\le\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}(z)\Big|(1-|z_k|^2)^p\\
&+(1-\frac{1}{m})\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\Big|\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_k}((1-\frac{1}{m})z)\Big|(1-|(1-\frac{1}{m})z_k|^2)^p\\
&\le\|f\|_p+\|f\|_p=2\|f\|_p,
\end{aligned}$$

so $\|I-K_m\| \leq 2$.

(vi) For any compact subset $E \subset U^n$, $\exists r$, $0<r<1$ such that $E \subset rU^n \subset\subset U^n$. For $\forall z \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(I-K_m)f(z)| &= |f(z)-f_m(z)| = |f(z)-f(r_m z)| \\
&= \left|\int_{r_m}^1 \frac{d}{dt}(f(tz))dt\right| = \left|\int_{r_m}^1 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial w_k}(tz)\cdot z_k dt\right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{r_m}^1 \left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_k}(tz)\right| dt.
\end{aligned}$$

$t \in [r_m,1]$, $\forall z \in U^n$, $|tz_k| = t|z_k| < |z_k| < r$, so $\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial w_k}(w)$ is bounded in $r\overline{U^n}$, i.e., $\forall z \in E$, $\left|\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial w_k}(tz)\right| \leq M$. So

$$|(I-K_m)f(z)| \leq nM(1-r_m) \to 0$$

as $m \to \infty$, the results follows.

Now return to the upper estimate. For the convenience, we denote $\|f\| = \|f\|_p$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|C_\phi\|_e \leq \|C_\phi - C_\phi K_m\| = \|C_\phi(I-K_m)\| = \sup_{\|f\|=1} \|C_\phi(I-K_m)f\|_q \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|=1}\left(\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^n \left\{\left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)(f\circ\phi)}{\partial z_k}\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q\right\} + |(I-K_m)f(\phi(0))|\right) \\
&\leq \sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k=1}^n\sum_{l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial w_l}(\phi(z))\right|\left|\frac{\partial\phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|(1-|z_k|^2)^q \\
&+ \sup_{\|f\|=1}\left|f(\phi(0)) - f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0))\right| \\
&\leq \sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{z\in U^n}\sum_{k,l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial\phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}\left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial w_l}(\phi(z))\right|(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p \\
&+ \sup_{\|f\|=1}\left|f(\phi(0)) - f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0))\right|. \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $G_1 = \{z \in U^n : dist(\phi(z), \partial U^n) < \delta\}$, $G_2 = \{z \in U^n : dist(\phi(z), \partial U^n) \geq \delta\}$, $G = \{w \in U^n : dist(w, \partial U^n) \geq \delta\}$, where G is a compact subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Then by Lemma 3, Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, condition (9) holds, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\|C_\phi\|_e \leq\ & \sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{z\in G_1}\sum_{k,l=1}^n \left|\frac{\partial\phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}\left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial w_l}(\phi(z))\right|(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^q \\
& +C\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{z\in G_2}\sum_{l=1}^n(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial w_l}(\phi(z))\right| \\
& + \sup_{\|f\|=1}\left|f(\phi(0)) - f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0))\right| \\
\leq\ & \|I-K_m\|\sup_{z\in G_1}\sum_{k,l=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial\phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+C\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{z\in G_2}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial w_l}(\phi(z))\right| \\
&+\sup_{\|f\|=1}\left|f(\phi(0))-f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0))\right| \\
\leq\ & 2\sup_{z\in G_1}\sum_{k,l=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial\phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p} \\
&+C\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{z\in G_2}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial(I-K_m)f}{\partial w_l}(\phi(z))\right| \\
&+\sup_{\|f\|=1}\left|f(\phi(0))-f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0))\right|. \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote the second term and third term of the right hand side of (27) by I_1 and I_2. Then Theorem 1 is proved if we can prove

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} I_1=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m\to\infty} I_2=0.$$

To do this, let $z\in G_2$ and $w=\phi(z)$, then $w\in G$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 \leq\ & C\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{w\in G}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-|w_l|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)-(1-\frac{1}{m})\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}((1-\frac{1}{m})w)\right| \\
\leq\ & C\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{w\in G}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-|w_l|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)-\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}((1-\frac{1}{m})w)\right| \\
&+\frac{C}{m}\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{w\in G}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-|w_l|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}((1-\frac{1}{m})w)\right| \\
\leq\ & C\sup_{\|f\|=1}\sup_{w\in G}\sum_{l=1}^{n}(1-|w_l|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)-\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}((1-\frac{1}{m})w)\right|+\frac{C}{m}. \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $w=(w_1,w_2,\cdots,w_{n-1},w_n)$, for m large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)-\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}((1-\frac{1}{m})w)\right| \\
&\leq\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}\left((1-\frac{1}{m})w_1,\cdots,(1-\frac{1}{m})w_{j-1},w_j,\cdots,w_n\right)\right. \\
&\left.-\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}\left((1-\frac{1}{m})w_1,\cdots,(1-\frac{1}{m})w_j,w_{j+1},\cdots,w_n\right)\right| \\
&=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left|\int_{(1-\frac{1}{m})w_j}^{w_j}\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial w_l\partial w_j}\left((1-\frac{1}{m})w_1,\cdots,(1-\frac{1}{m})w_{j-1},\zeta,w_{j+1},\cdots,w_n\right)d\zeta\right| \\
&\leq\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\sup_{w\in G}\left|\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial w_l\partial w_j}(w)\right|. \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $G_3=\left\{w\in U^n: dist(w,\partial U^n)>\dfrac{\delta}{2}\right\}$, then $G\subset G_3\subset\subset U^n$.

Since $dist(G, \partial G_3) = \dfrac{\delta}{2}$, then by Lemma 7, (29) gives

$$\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}((1-\frac{1}{m})w)\right| \leq \frac{2n\sqrt{n}}{m\delta} \max_{z\in G_3}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)\right|. \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, on the unit ball of $\mathcal{B}^p(U^n)$, we have

$$\sup_{z\in G_3}(1-|w_l|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)\right| = \sup_{dist(w,\partial U^n)>\frac{\delta}{2}}(1-|w_l|^2)^p\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)\right| \leq \|f\|_p = 1,$$

namely

$$\sup_{z\in G_3}\left|\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_l}(w)\right| \leq \frac{1}{1-\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2} = \frac{4}{4-\delta^2}. \tag{31}$$

Combining (28), (30) and (31), imply

$$I_1 \leq \frac{2n\sqrt{n}C}{m\delta}\frac{4}{4-\delta^2} + \frac{C}{m}$$

and $\lim\limits_{m\to\infty} I_1 = 0$.

Now we can prove $\lim\limits_{m\to\infty} I_2 = 0$. In fact,

$$f(\phi(0)) - f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0)) = \int_{\frac{m-1}{m}}^1 \frac{df(t\phi(0))}{dt}dt = \sum_{l=1}^n \int_{\frac{m-1}{m}}^1 \phi_l(0)\frac{\partial f}{\partial \zeta_l}(t\phi(0))dt.$$

By Lemma 1, it follows that for any compact subset $K \subset U^n$, $|f(z)| \leq C_K\|f\|_p = C_K$. Let $K = \{z \in U^n : |z_i| \leq |\phi_i(0)|\}$, So

$$|f(\phi(0)) - f(\frac{m-1}{m}\phi(0))| \leq \sum_{l=1}^n |\phi_l(0)| \int_{\frac{m-1}{m}}^1 C_K dt \leq nC_K(1-\frac{m-1}{m}) = \frac{nC_K}{m},$$

so $I_2 \leq \frac{nC_K}{m} \to 0$. Thus let first $m \to \infty$, then $\delta \to 0$ in (27), we get the upper estimate of $\|C_\phi\|_e$:

$$\|C_\phi\|_e \leq 2\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{dist(\phi(z),\partial U^n)<\delta}\sum_{k,l=1}^n\left|\frac{\partial\phi_l}{\partial z_k}(z)\right|\frac{(1-|z_k|^2)^q}{(1-|\phi_l(z)|^2)^p}.$$

Now the proof of Theorem 1 is finished.

References

[1] R. Timoney, Bloch function in several complex variables, I, Bull. London Math. Soc., 1980, 12(37): 241-267.

[2] R. Timoney, Bloch function in several complex variables, II, J. Reine Angew. Math., 1980, 319: 1-22.

[3] K. Madigan and A. Matheson, Compact composition operators on the Bloch space. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.,1995, 347 (7) : 2679-2687.

[4] Z. H. Zhou and J. H. Shi, Compact composition operators on the Bloch spaces in polydiscs, Science in China (Series A), 2001, 44 (3):286-291.

[5] Z. H. Zhou and J. H. Shi, Composition operators on the Bloch space in polydiscs, Complex Variables, 2001, 46(1): 73-88.

[6] Z. H. Zhou and J. H. Shi, Compactness of composition operators on the Bloch space in classical bounded symmetric domains. The Michigan Mathematical Journal, 2002, 50(2):381-405.

[7] Z. H. Zhou, Composition Operators on the Lipschitz Spaces in Polydiscs. Science in China A, 2003, 46(1):33-38.

[8] J. H. Shapiro, The essential norm of a composition operator, Annals of Math., 1987, 125: 375-404.

[9] J. H. Shapiro, Composition operators and Classical Function Theory, Spring-Verlag, 1993.

[10] Alsonso Montes-Rodriguez, The essential normal of a composition operator on the Bloch space. Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 1999, 188(2): 339-351.